

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/920,915	FYFE, EDWARD ROBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael I Poe	1732	

All Participants:

(1) Michael I Poe (Examiner).

(2) Edward Weller (Applicant's attorney).

Status of Application: Amended after Non-Final Rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 October 2004

Time: 4:30 pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None specifically

Claims discussed:

26-38

Prior art documents discussed:

None specifically

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendment necessary to place the application in condition for allowance. The examiner first proposed changing the title and abstract so that they better reflected the allowed invention. The examiner further proposed deleting the second occurrence of "boron" on page 5 of the applicant's disclosure and in claim 32 to thereby eliminate the redundancy in both. The examiner further proposed amending claim 35 to correct a minor typographical error (e.g., a missing comma after "vinyl") and to eliminate any question of new matter (e.g., changing "water proofing membrane" to "resistive materials"). The examiner finally proposed amending claim 36 to clarify the language of the claim (e.g., changing "coupled" to "by coupling the reinforcing bar"). The applicant's attorney approved these proposed changes and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment. Refer to the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of changes.